



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

'You may have one royal eye, for all that, if you please; it is only when you rise up to fly, holding the vultur's wing still, and moving the eagle's only; by which means, you will see clearly with one, though not at all with the other.' . . . I acted as he advised me, and no sooner moved my eagle's wing, than a great light came all around me, and I saw everything as clear as possible: looking down to earth, I beheld distinctly cities and men, and every thing that passed amongst them."

If I interpret correctly, the Heralds, when they appeared on the stage, were fitted with wings as was Menippus. During the four lines just quoted, they moved their wings gently. This, like an enchantment, was supposed to bring to the vision of the spectators the surface of the moon peopled with Volatees.

JOSEPH QUINCY ADAMS, JR.

Cornell University.

PARTINUPLÉS DE BLES. AN EPISODE
IN TIRSO'S *Amar por Señas*. LOPE'S
La viuda valenciana.

Bödtker¹ has recently published a masterly treatment of *Parténopeus de Blois*, in European literature, correcting and completing the various studies by Kölbing, Massman and others, although primarily concerned only with the relations of the Icelandic and Danish versions to the Old French poem. On the whole, one needs must subscribe to the classification proposed by Bödtker,² but there are certain tests which he has neglected to use, and which might modify his classification in minor details. Some points may be mentioned here for reconsideration. No use has been made, for instance, of Weingärtner,³ and the fragment published by Wülker from the Lord Robartes' manuscript,⁴ has received no mention whatsoever.

¹ *Parténopeus de Blois. Étude comparative . . .* par A. Trampe Bödtker. *Videnskabs-Selskabets Skrifter, II. Hist.-Filos. Kl. 1904, No. 3.*

² Cf. Stengel's favorable, although brief, review in the *Deutsche Literaturzeitung*, 1905, cols. 34-35.

³ *Die mittelhochl. Fassungen der P.-sage und ihr Verhältnis zum altfranz. Originale.* Breslau, 1888.

⁴ *Anglia*, Vol. XII, pp. 607 ff. Cf. also Kölbing, *Englische Studien*, Vol. XIV, pp. 435-7.

I would not insist upon the importance of this fragment, and refer to it merely for the sake of completeness. No copy of the Crapelet edition of *Parténopeus de Blois* being accessible to me, I refrain from discussing its relation to the other English fragments, or to the Old French poem. It doubtless belongs to the group Y. Long since, Köhler, in a discussion of a passage in the *Orlando Furioso*,⁵ threw out a hint that might have served both Bödtker and Sneyders de Vogel⁶ in good stead. Such an episode—*das vom Sterbenden nicht vollendete Wort*⁷—is a very important one for fixing the filiation of the various versions and adaptations. It is not in Konrad von Würzburg's version, nor in those of the Peninsula. How far this is due to chance, it would be impossible to determine. As for the Spanish and Catalan versions, it will be seen below that exception may be made to Bödtker's classification.

Before coming to the subject proper of this article, attention may be called to the striking use of the Spanish name *Urraque* in *Parténopeus*.—Of the soil too is the episode in which the hero on his return to the enchanted palace is heart-broken because he has forgotten to bid farewell to the fifty Spanish subjects at the court of the French king.—In some of the manuscripts of *Parténopeus*, the spelling *Urracle* is found; but the rime with *miracle* puts us on our guard against a learned orthography.⁸ The name is extremely rare in mediæval French literature, if, indeed, it occurs at all outside of the poem in discussion. Diligent search in the *chansons de geste*—confirmed by Langlois' *Table des noms propres . . . dans les chansons de geste*,—and in *romans d'aventure*, etc., has revealed not a single instance of its use. In the name and episode referred to we may simply have another instance of Spanish and French interrelations during the twelfth century,⁹

⁵ *Eine Stelle in Ariostos Orlando Furioso und Nachahmungen derselben.* Archiv, 1876. Cf. *Kleinere Schriften*, Vol. III, pp. 1 ff.

⁶ *La suite du Parthénopeu de Blois et la version Hollandaise*, *Revue des langues romanes*, 1905, pp. 5 ff.

⁷ Melior does not die, however, on pronouncing *Parto*, but her voice grows feeble as she concludes with—*nopeu*.

⁸ Cf. *Saint Jaque: Romacle*, [Fabliau] Du chevalier à la robe vermeille.

⁹ Cf. Puymaigre, *Revue Hispanique*, 1895, pp. 163 ff.

rather than an indication that the legend first appeared in the Peninsula.

The object of the present article is, however, to define more exactly the bibliography of the chap-book as printed in the Peninsula, and to attempt a classification of the many prints.¹⁰

CASTILIAN I. 1513?-1705?

On account of the erroneous reference given by Antonio to an edition, printed at Tarragona, 1488 (most recently discussed by Haebler, *Bibliografía Ibérica del siglo XV*), it used to be argued that the earliest edition published in Spain was Catalan. Hence, too, certain theories as to Catalan authorship (cf. Gallardo, No. 1017 n.). The earliest edition seems to have been one published at Alcalá de Henares, 1513. Haebler refers to a copy in the University Library at Barcelona, without date or place. He feels sure that it did not appear before 1500; but he fails to give further details. The Castilian editions up to 1705(?) followed the Alcalá text very closely; then appeared a new adaptation, the work of a certain Gaspar Aldana (cf. *infra*).

- *1513. Alcalá de Henares. Mentioned in the Bure catalogue. Probably lost. Cf. Gallardo, No. 1017.
- ? (1515. Alcalá de Henares. Referred to by Moratín, a careless bibliographer, in his *Orígenes del teatro*. Cf. Rivad., Vol. II, p. 174. The title is the same as in the edition just cited, and the inference is that 1515 ought to read 1513.)
- 1526. Toledo. The oldest edition now accessible, (Mazarine Library). Described by Gallardo, No. 1018, etc.
- *1547. Burgos. Cf. Gallardo, No. 1020. Bib. del Excmo. Sr. D. José de Salamanca. Amador de los Ríos, Vol. VII, p. 377, n. 1. Brunet states that there is a copy in the Mazarine Library; if so, it was not accessible to me in 1903-4 when I copied the Toledo text.
- Alcalá [de Henares] referred to by Ebert. The cataloguers of the British Museum Library make the query whether the mutilated edition described below is of this date and place. Buckley's reference in his edition of the English version of *Parténopous, Rozburghe Club*, 1862, p. xxxvi, is apparently not at first-hand.
- *1548. Sevilla, Ebert, etc. Details in Gallardo, No. 1022. I have not succeeded in finding a copy of this edition.
- ? (1558. Sevilla, cited by Conchu (*Bibliothèque des Romans*, dec. 1779). The description of this

edition corresponds with the Sevilla edition of 1548, and may be an error (?). No copy known.)

- 1560? Sevilla? British Mus. Mutilated copy. Cf. above, edition of Alcalá, 1547. Gallardo refers to this edition, No. 1021. Read, however, muye | forçado (sic). It was published probably about 1560, and in Sevilla, as may be inferred from the fact that two copies of another chap-book (*La historia del rey Canamor*), in apparently the same series, are dated 1567 and 1588 respectively. The colophon of the second states that the work was printed *en Sevilla, en casa de Sebastian Trugillo*. In both, however, although the press-work is strikingly alike, the title is in red, not in black, as in the *Partinuplés* text.
- Gallardo, No. 1019, refers to an edition in the British Museum, without date or place. But such a text (in Gothic letter) is no longer there. It might repay the pains to compare Gallardo's description with the copy in the University of Barcelona.
- 1623. Valladolid. Bibl. Nat. Paris. Inv. Res. Ybis 1,077. Sign. A₂-F₄. *El Conde Partinuples* (wood-cut: draped horse, prancing). *Libro del esforçado cauallero el Conde Partinuples*, | que fue Emperador de Constantinopla. Impresso con licencia en | Valladolid, por la viuda de Francisco Fernandnz [sic] de Cordoua, Año de 1623.
- ? (1643. Sevilla. Referred to at first-hand by Conchu alone. Cf. Gallardo, No. 1024.)
- *1643. Sevilla. The unique copy of this edition, different from the one just referred to, is in the University Library of Göttingen. I am indebted to Dr. Reicke for the following description: *El Conde Partinuples, La coronica de el muy valiente, y esforçado Cauallero el Conde Partinuples, y de sus grandes hechos en Armas* . . . Impresso en Seuilla, por Pedro Gomez de Pastrana. A la Esquina de la Carcel Real. Año de 1643.
- *1693. Sevilla. Cf. Gallardo, No. 1025.

CASTILIAN II. 1705?-1856?

About 1700 appeared an abridged edition of *Partinuplés* "compuesta" by a certain Gaspar Aldana. About Aldana the works accessible to me are silent. His text follows the original rather closely, but the following changes are to be noted: The Pope's niece, who is to become Partinuplés' wife, is given a name, Elenisa; Gaudin becomes Guadin. There are minor changes in the wording, but the plot remains the same. Aldana's text was reprinted as in the 1705? edition until about 1856?.

¹⁰ Texts of which there are inadequate descriptions, or which have not been examined by the present writer, are marked by an asterisk, and are classified by inference alone.

1705? Madrid. *Historia | del Noble, y esforzado Cauallero, | el conde | Partinuples, | Emperador | de*

Constantinopla. | Compuesta por Gaspar Aldana. (Wood-cut: knight on horse-back.) *Con licencia: En Madrid, por Francisco Sana. . .* In fol. Without date, but another chap-book (*La historia de Carlo Magno*) in the same series, is dated 1705. Bibl. Nac., Madrid.

- *1739. Madrid. *Historia | del muy noble, | y esforzado cavallero | el conde Partinuplés | emperador | de Constantinopla | compuesta | por Gaspar | Aldana | Año* (wood-cut, knight on horse-back, between banners) 1739. *Hallarse en Madrid en la Imprenta de Antonio Sanz | en la Plazuela de la calle de la Paz |*. 40 pp., 4to. This edition has been neglected by bibliographers. The only copy is at the Royal Library, Berlin, and I owe the description of it to the kindness of Dr. Perlbach.

1756. Madrid. *Historia | del muy noble, | y esforzado cavallero | el conde | Partinoples . . . compuesta | por Gaspar Aldana,* (wood-cut: two knights attacking each other), *Año 1756. Hallarse en Madrid en la Imprenta de | Antonio Sanz . . .* In fol. Brit. Mus.

1756. Valencia. Salvá, No. 1655.

- 1800? Córdoba. *Historia | del muy noble y esforzado cavallero | El conde Partinuples | . . . compuesta por Gaspar Aldana. | Con licencia: En Córdoba, en la imprenta de D. Rafael Garcia | Rodríguez, Calle de la Librería.* This edition Salvá (No. 1654) places about 1750, but in one of the chap-books of this series (Bibl. Nat., Paris, Inv. Res. Y² 1,040), *Historia del descubrimiento de las tierras de los Gigantes*, there is a reference to an event which occurred in 1792. A copy in the Bibl. Nac., Madrid, also in Brit. Mus., whose catalogue asks whether this edition is of the year 1820.

CASTILIAN III. 1856—.

About 1856 there appeared in Madrid an abridged and sorely mutilated version of Aldana's text. This process of mutilation and curtailment was not limited to our chap-book, but is noticeable in a large number of others. It is these garbled editions that the vendors of *libros de cordel* to-day sell in the markets and highways of Spain, with their characteristic cry: *leyenda! leyenda! mejor que en los libros* [sic!]. The most important changes in the text are: Julian becomes Juan; Melior is now called Leonisa (a corruption of Elenisa, the Pope's niece, and now no longer named?); Urraque becomes Oriana,¹¹ but is no longer Melior's step-sister, but a lady-in-waiting; Guadin's (sic) marriage is not mentioned at all.

1856. Madrid. (Wood-cut: knight addressing a lady on a throne.) *Historia | del muy noble y es-*

forzado cavallero | conde Partinoples | el cual llegó á ser emperador de Constantinopla | Reformada y compendiada de la que compuso Gaspar Aldana | Madrid. | Se hallará de venta en la Plaza de Riego . . . 1856. 7 chapters, 32 pages, 4°.

1878. Madrid. *Historia | del muy noble y esforzado cavallero | Conde Partinoples, . . . Reformada, etc. Madrid: 1878. | Despacho calle de Juanelo, num. 19. 4 pliegos, 4°.*
- 1880? Madrid, Barcelona. *Historia del muy noble | y esforzado cavallero | conde Partinoples | Reformada, etc. | Despachos: | Madrid | Hernando, Arenal | Barcelona | Bou de la Plaza Nueva, 13. 4 pliegos, 4°.* I have a copy.

CASTILIAN IV. UNCLASSIFIED.

- *1700. Barcelona? Valladolid? Gayangos, Rivad., Vol. XI, p. lxxxii, states that Salvá in the *Reperitorio Americano* refers to an edition of about the year 1700, without date or place, but probably of Barcelona or Valladolid.

1842. Barcelona. *Historia | del esforçado cavallero | Partinoples | conde de Bles; | . . . ahora nuevamente traducida de la lengua catalana | en la nuestra castellana . . . En Barcelona: | Por José Torner | calle del Regomí No. 22 | 1842. 4°.* This edition is the only Castilian text translated from Catalan. The work is preceded by a prologue by the "editores" (i. e., publishers). They state, among other remarks, that the Castilian edition indicated by Moratín (cf. *supra*) being inaccessible to them, they have been obliged to resort to the *traducción catalana que corre en dos* [sic] *distintas impresiones, una de Barcelona y otra de Tarragona. Tenemos noticia de otra edición mas antigua también catalana, que no nos ha sido dable ver por lo mucho que escasean los ejemplares . . .* The only old Catalan edition of Barcelona that has been recorded is the one cited by Brunet (cf. *infra*). The Tarragona edition may be the one of 1700?, and the older print referred to would be the Tarragona edition of 1588. The archaisms in this translation are striking and puzzling, e. g.: vido = vió (p. 167); en le viendo Guadin, demandógele (p. 168); habedes (*ibid.*); estonce (*ibid.*); los sus dos pages (p. 169), etc. These are not Catalanisms, but why should archaic speech be affected in such a work? I have a copy. Bibl. Nac., Madrid.

CATALAN I. 1588—.

¹¹ From *Amadís*; Leonisa and Elenisa recall Elisena of the same work.

Morel-Fatio (*Grundriss der roman. Phil.*, II, 2, p. 124) repeats the doubts of previous critics, (1) as to whether the Catalan version is derived from a French or Provençal

origin, or (2) whether it is a translation from the Castilian. It may be noted, (1) that no Provençal edition is recorded, (2) that the earliest known Catalan edition appeared seventy-five years after the first Castilian edition, and, moreover, distinctly states on the title page, *novament traduyda de llengua castellana en la nostra cathalana*. But,—and here's the rub,—was this Catalan edition based on the Castilian version as it has come down to us? The oldest Catalan edition, now accessible, is one of Tarragona, 1700? (*cf. infra*). The title corresponds closely with that of the 1588 edition described by Gallardo, No. 1023, and one may infer that the contents are the same. It is true that the Catalan editions, without exception, bear on the title-page the words, *novament traduyda*, etc., but, as will be seen in the bibliographical examination below, the remark is merely reprinted from previous editions, an examination of the editions subsequent to 1700, at least, showing no influence of the Castilian text. To return to the difficulty noted above, Gaudin in the Catalan version *se feu Christià, y fonch casat ab la Donzella Urraca*. Castilian, Nos. I, II, simply state, *desque fue tornado christiana luego lo hizo condestable de su imperio z lo caso con una donzella hija dalgo z muy hermosa* (the edition of 1705? *con una Dama muy noble y muy hermosa*). In Castilian No. III, no mention of Gaudin's marriage is made. Castilian, No. IV, follows the Catalan version. Is it a mere coincidence that the earliest Castilian edition in this detail resembles all the manuscripts of the Old French version, except the Arsenal copy, whereas the Catalan text is like the versions of the North and the Italian story of Gherardino and Fata Bianca? It would appear then (1) that the words, *novament traduyda* are a figment, or, (2) that an intermediate Castilian text, differing in this respect from the extant version, has been lost. At any rate, Bödtker's classification requires some readjustment, or a more satisfactory solution of the problem just raised.

*1588. Tarragona. Cf. Gallardo, No. 1033.

1700? Tarragona. *Assi comensa | la general historia | del Esforçat cavaller . . . y al ultim và anyadida una Decima burlesca* (wood-cut: knight with lance). Tarragona: *Per Magè Canals Estamper, y Llibreter, al carrer Mayor*. 4°. n. d. Bibl. Nac., Madrid. Brit. Mus.

1700? An imperfect copy in the Bibl. Nac., Madrid (R. 8316), is very similar to the edition just described. Last page (182) begins, *llur estat: y nostre Senyor Jesu Crhit*. n. d.

1700? Gerona. Three editions appeared at Gerona, published by the Bros. (a) Gallardo, No. 1026 (*Joseph Bró . . . en la Plaza del Vi*); a copy in the Imperial library at Vienna. (b) I have a copy similar to the one just mentioned, but *Per Joseph Bró, als quatre Cantons*. Buckley had a copy of this edition *op. cit.*, p. xlvii). (c) Gallardo notes a third, *Per Jaume Bró*, 8°. My friend, M. Lemaître, gives me the following details of another Gerona edition (likewise without date), at

the Bibl. Nat. Paris (Y² 14706), *Assi comensa | la general historia | del esforsat cavaller | Partinoples | comptes [sic] de Bles, y apres fonch | emperador de Constantinolla [sic?] Novament traduhida de llengua castellana | etc.* (Wood-cut, as in Gerona edition (b). *Ab llicencia | Gerona: en la estampa de Anton Olivia, estamper, y llibreter en las ballesterras*. 8°, 155 pp. and 5 not paginated, containing likewise the *obligaciò que tenen los marits, y las mollers*, also the *Decimas burlescas*[?]

*1700? Barcelona. Brunet refers to an edition, without date, published by Rafel Figueró. 8°.

1720. Vich. *Assi comensa | la general historia | del esforçat | Cavaller | Partinoples, | Comte de Bles: y apres | . . .* (wood-cut, as in previously cited Catalan prints). Vich: *Per Joan Dorca, y Morera Estamper*. 164 pp. Brit. Mus. Bibl. Nac., Madrid.

1844. Barcelona. *Historia | del esforçat cavaller | Partinoples | Compte de Bles. | y apres fonch | Emperador . . . Escrita [sic!] en nostra llengua Catalana. | Barcelona: Estampa de Miguel Borrás . . .* 1844. Small octavo. Bibl. Nac., Madrid.

Readers of Tirso de Molina's *Amor por señas* (1606?) must have been struck by the peculiar atmosphere of mystery that pervades Act I, with vague reminiscences of *Partinoplès de Bles*, all confirmed by Montoya's remark:

Si te encanta
qualche princesa o infanta,
llámate Partinuplés.

(Ed. 1839, Vol. VIII, p. 27.)

There can be little doubt but that the introductory episode of this play is a conscious reproduction, or adaptation, of the chap-book under discussion,—and the result is an infinitely more valuable product than Ana Caro's mediocre comedia, *El conde Partinuplés*. Calderon, somewhat later, imitated the first act of *Amor por señas* in *El encanto sin encanto* (*Jornada segunda, escena XVI*, to the end of the play). The story of *Partinuplés de Bles* haunted the writers of Spain, more especially during the first half of the seventeenth century, as might be shown by the constant reference to our hero.¹²

¹² The earliest reference is probably in the *glosa* to the romance:

Oh Belerma! Oh Belerma!

Por mi mal fuiste engendrada. The *glosa* may be read in

It will be recalled that the scene of *Amar por señas* is in France (Lorraine).¹³ Gabriel is enamoured of Beatriz, who, however, is to wed his master. He flees from Lorraine. Meanwhile a servant of Beatriz overtakes him and deprives him of his *maleta* in the hope that their mistress may thus identify Gabriel whom she loves. He pursues the thief and is finally lost in a *Sala de la quinta*. *Una chimenea; un torno como de monjas en la pared, una luz en un bufete*. He exclaims:

Hombre ¿estás encantado?
 Cuando corro tras ti por bosque y prado,
 sus alas te da el viento;
 si te pierdo de vista, a paso lento
 me aguardas; . . .
 Siguiéndote me traes de sala en sala,
 despues que en esta quinta
 entraste, que de Circe hechizos pinta;
 sola y deshabitada,
 de luces y tápices adornada.
 A nadie en ella veo.
 O loco estoy, o lo que sueño creo.

The thief extinguishes the light and escapes, leaving Gabriel alone. Meanwhile the lacquey, Montoya, has been let down the chimney. The *torno* revolves, *con dos luces en candeleros de plata, recado para escribir y un billete*. Presently it revolves again: *Vuelvese el torno con luz y con un tabaque grande y curioso lleno de comida: Cubrenle unos manteles, y sobre ellos viene otro papel*.

At this point the lacquey exclaims:

Si te encanta
qualche princesa o infanta,
 llámate Partinuplés.

Here the element of mystery comes to a close and the resemblance to the story of *Partinuplés de Bles* ceases. Not to be overlooked, however, is

Gallardo, Vol. I, col. 588; *ibid.*, col. 822. Salvá, Vol. I, pp. 29-30, refers to a copy of about 1530. The reference to Hernando de Andrada, a general under Charles V, might help to fix the date more precisely. A reference by Loyola (Macedonio de) in his *Viaje y naufragio de Macedonio de Loyola*, 1587, shows how *Partinuplés* had by the end of the sixteenth century become part and parcel of Spanish literature, as much as *Amadís de Gaula*, or the *Doce Pares*.

¹³ The contents of the *Partinuplés* chap-book are easily accessible in Dunlop's *History of Fiction*, 1888, Vol. I, pp. 406 ff., or of the Old French poem in Gröber's *Grundriss*, Vol. II, pp. 586-7. Tirso's play is quoted from the 1839 edition, Vol. VIII.

Filipo's remark (p. 89) to Armesinda, *Condesa de Bles eres*.¹⁴

It seems to have escaped the notice of critics that the plot of Lope de Vega's *La viuda valenciana* (ca. 1604)¹⁵ is strikingly reminiscent of *Partinuplés*. This a brief analysis of the play will show: Leonarda, a rich widow, living in retirement, is averse to all thoughts of a second marriage. But one day she sees Camilo and becomes enamoured of him. Lest she incur criticism for her fickleness, more especially as she has long repelled the advances of suitors, she has Camilo meet her servant, by night, at a certain bridge. There he is blindfolded and conducted to her presence. She forbids him ever to attempt to see her. These mysterious interviews are continued for some time, until Camilo determines, even at the risk of his life, to solve the mystery. To this end he conceals a lantern under his cloak; on producing it, she cries out. Her uncle enters, and, to be brief, she is obliged to admit her love for Camilo, and concludes by marrying him.

It would be difficult to decide whether Lope took the suggestion for this plot from Apuleius, or from *Partinuplés*. The *Golden Ass* was a familiar book in Spain; moreover, Lope makes Camilo say,—in reply to the servant's suggestion that he take along a lantern,—

Podráme costar la vida,
 Floro, aqueste atrevimiento;
 Que si Psíques vió al Amor,
 A quien á oscuras gozaba
 Perdió la gloria en que estaba,
 Y negoció su dolor.

(ed. Rivad., p. 80 c.)

On the other hand, Lope's plot resembles that of *Partinuplés* more closely, especially in the following important details: firstly, in the matter of the sexes of the protagonists, and, secondly, in the conclusion. In the story of Cupid and Psyche, it is Cupid who forbids Psyche to attempt to see

¹⁴ It may be noted here that the reference in *Don Gil de las Calzas verdes*, ed. Bourland, 1901, pp. 142-3, is not to what is distant so much as to what is mysterious. Cf. especially, *El Castigo del penséque*, Vol. V, p. 135; and *El Amparo de los hombres*, fol. 7 vo. in the copy of the Royal Library at Munich. A good instance is in Tirso, vol. V, p. 292.

¹⁵ Not 1619, as in Rennert, p. 263. For plays based on the Apuleius story, see Schmidt, *Die S. Calderon's*, ch. 76.

him. In Apuleius, too, the irate god flies from Psyche, leaving her a prey to remorse. In *Par-tinuplés*, on the contrary, Melior is, indeed, wroth, but a marriage finally ensues.

MILTON A. BUCHANAN.

University of Chicago.

CYNEWULF, *Christ* 1320.

In the note on *synrūst* in my edition, reproduced from *Mod. Lang. Notes*, I was not able to refer the idea to an earlier source than Prudentius. I should have done better to turn to Gregory the Great, or rather to the 24th chapter of Ezekiel. The passage in Gregory is (Migne 77. 71) :

‘Hinc rursum scriptum est [Ezek. 24. 12] : “Multo labore sudatum est, et non exivit de ea nimia rubigo ejus, neque per ignem.” Ignem quippe nobis tribulationis admovet, ut in nobis rubiginem vitiorum purget ; sed nec per ignem rubiginem amittimus, quando et inter flagella vitio non caremus.’

The passage from Gregory is thus translated by Alfred (Sweet’s ed., 269. 11–17) :

‘Bi ðām ilcan is eft āwriten : “Ðær wæs suððe suððlic gesuinc, and ðær wæs micel swāt āgoten, and ðēah ne meahte monn him of āniman ðone miclan rūst, ne furðum mid fýre ne meahte hiene mon āweg ādōn.” Hē ūs stiereð mid fýres broce, forðæmðe hē wolde from ūs ādōn ðone rūst ūrra unðeāwa, ac wē ðēah for ðām broce ðæs fýres nyllað ālætan from ūs ðæt rūst ðāra unnyttrea weorca, ðonne wē on ðære suingellan nyllað gebētān ūre unðeāwas.’

Ezekiel begins the use of the word in 24. 6 : ‘Væ civitati sanguinum, ollæ cujus rubigo in ea est, et rubigo ejus non exivit de ea’ ; and continues it in 24. 11, leading up to the verse quoted by Gregory : ‘Pone quoque eam super prunas vacuam, ut incalescat, et liquefiat æs ejus ; et conflatur in medio ejus inquinamentum ejus, et consumatur rubigo ejus.’

Jerome, in his commentary on Ezekiel (Migne 25. 226), makes *rubigo* = *malitia*.

It appears from the foregoing that my conjecture that *rubigo*, rather than *cærgo*, underlies Cynewulf’s word, is corroborated by the verses in Ezekiel, and their interpretation by Latin commentators.

ALBERT S. COOK.

Yale University.

SOME NOTES ON *La Constante Amarilis* OF CHRISTOVAL SUAREZ DE FIGUEROA.

The pastoral romances were received with great favour in Spain in the latter part of the sixteenth and early part of the seventeenth century. Many illustrious poets, among them Cervantes and Lope de Vega, followed in the footsteps of the Portuguese Jorge de Montemayor, who had introduced this new form of literature into Spain. Suarez de Figueroa’s pastoral romance, *La Constante Amarilis*, was published at Valencia, 1609, and the *Aprobacion* was signed August 1, of that year. Figueroa himself did not seem to think highly of his work, but it was praised by Cervantes in the *Viaje del Parnaso* :

“Figueroa estotro, el Doctorado,
Que cantó de Amarili la Constancia
En dulce prosa, y verso regalado.”¹

In 1614 a French translation of the *Constante Amarilis* by N. Lancelot, was printed at Lyon.

According to our eyes, the pastoral romances have many faults. We complain of their artificiality and of their incongruities, just as the authors themselves must have done, for no one laughed at them more heartily than Cervantes, in his *Coloquio de los Perros*. However, in Spain, the pastoral romances served a capital purpose, they allowed the poet to celebrate his patron or his friends with enough disguise to prevent the flattery from being too apparent. Montemayor is the protagonist of his *Diana*,² under the name of Sireno, and Lope de Vega tells us that Diana was a lady of Valencia de Don Juan.³ Cervantes followed suit and introduced some of his friends as shepherds in the *Galatea*. Lope de Vega celebrated the young Duke Antonio de Alba

¹ According to Barrera, *Nueva Biografía de Lope de Vega*, p. 307, Figueroa is the “*forte calvo cuidam, tuberosi admodum vultus*” mentioned in the *Expostulatio Spongiæ*. It is interesting as giving us the only hint we have of the personal appearance of our author. Clemencin, note to *Don Quixote*, vol. VI, p. 441, conjectured that the *Amarilis* of Figueroa was, perhaps, the actress Maria de Cordoba, merely from the fact, I presume, that the actress was generally known under the name of *Amarilis*.

² Ticknor, *Historia de la literatura española*. Sp. translation, Vol. III, p. 277.

³ *Dorotea*, Act II, scene ii ; Ticknor, *idem*.